

USSN 09/500,698

Page 10 of 13

REMARKS

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action mailed February 23, 2006. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-35, 39, 41-48, and 50 are pending. Claims 1, 22, 31, 39, 48, and 50 are amended to further define and clarify the claimed invention, for example, that multiple broadcast channels carry data associated with low-level data objects and that the low-level data objects are ordered by retrieval priority. Applicants traverse all of the rejections in the Office Action and respectfully request reconsideration and passage of the claims to allowance for the following reasons.

Claims Patentable over Baxter/Zigmond under §103

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3-4, 6-34, 39, 41, 43-48 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,356,903 to Baxter et al. (hereinafter "Baxter") in view of U.S. Patent 6,785,902 to Zigmond et al. (hereinafter "Zigmond").

According to MPEP §2143, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under §103, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The Office Action failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, because the combination of Baxter/Zigmond fails to teach or suggest the claimed

USSN 09/500,698

Page 11 of 13

invention. For example, the combination fails to teach or suggest the claimed multiple broadcast channels for carrying data associated with low-level data objects and the claimed low-level data objects in order by retrieval priority.

Independent claim 1 recites: (and independent claims 22, 31, 39, 48, and 50 recite similar subject matter)

1. A method for receiving data via multiple channel broadcast media, comprising:

receiving a request for a desired data object, said desired data object being associated with a first-level name;

obtaining a plurality of second-level names associated with said first-level name, each second-level name being associated with one of a plurality of low-level data objects, said low-level data objects being in order by retrieval priority; and

obtaining location information associated with said second-level names via a first broadcast channel, said location information identifying at least two of multiple broadcast channels for carrying data associated with said low-level data objects;

wherein said desired data object is a web page comprising at least a portion of said low-level data objects for retrieval and display in order defined by said retrieval priority.

The combination fails to teach or suggest the claimed multiple broadcast channels for carrying data associated with low-level data objects. By contrast, Baxter teaches content stored on a variety of devices, such as an optical drive 52 and a traditional data storage unit 50. (See Baxter, col. 5, lines 1-22; Figure 1.) Broadcast channels that carry data are not the same as storage devices.

The combination fails to teach or suggest the claimed low-level data objects in order by retrieval priority. By contrast, Baxter and Zigmond teach a display priority, not a retrieval priority. (See Zigmond, col. 3, lines 23-50; col. 4, lines 10-17 and 36-63; col. 6, lines 48-67; col. 7, lines 15-47.) (See Baxter, col. 2, lines 12-24; col. 4, lines 25-52; col. 13, lines 45-52; col. 16, lines 28-37.) In addition, the combination fails to teach low-level data objects in any particular order.

USSN 09/500,698

Page 12 of 13

Therefore, claims 1, 22, 31, 39, 48, and 50 are patentable over the combination of Baxter and Zigmond under §103.

Claims 3,4, 6-21, 23-30, 32-35, and 41-47 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 22, 31, 39, 48, and 50 respectively and, thus, inherit the patentable subject matter of these independent claims while adding or further defining elements. Therefore, claims 3,4, 6-21, 23-30, 32-35, and 41-47 are also patentable over the combination of Baxter and Zigmond under §103 for at least the reasons given above.

Claims Patentable over Baxter/Zigmond/Boon under §103

The Office Action rejected claim 35 as being unpatentable over Baxter and Zigmond in view of U.S. Patent 6,351,565 to Boon (hereinafter "Boon").

For the reasons given above, claim 35 is patentable over the combination of Baxter and Zigmond under §103. Moreover, Boon also fails to teach or suggest the claimed multiple broadcast channels for carrying data associated with low-level data objects and the claimed low-level data objects in order by retrieval priority.

Therefore, claim 35 is also patentable over the combination of Baxter, Zigmond, and Boon.

Claims Patentable over Baxter/Zigmond/Bisdikian under §103

The Office Action rejected claim 42 as being unpatentable over Baxter and Zigmond in view of U.S. Patent 6,047,317 to Bisdikian et al. (hereinafter "Bisdikian").

For the reasons given above, claim 42 is patentable over the combination of Baxter and Zigmond under §103. Moreover, Bisdikian also fails to teach or suggest the claimed multiple broadcast channels for carrying data associated with low-level data objects and the claimed low-level data objects in order by retrieval priority.

USSN 09/500,698

Page 13 of 13

Therefore, claim 35 is also patentable over the combination of Baxter, Zigmond, and Bisdikian.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and passage of the claims to allowance. If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Lea A. Nicholson or Eamon J. Wall at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

5/16/06



Eamon J. Wall, Attorney
Reg. No. 39,414
(732) 530-9404

Patterson & Sheridan, LLP
Attorneys at Law
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702